

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

These arguments are being submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 19, 2000. No claims have been amended, and claims 1-14 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application are respectfully requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Oracle. In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Oracle and Terry. In paragraph (5) of the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Oracle and Dworkin.

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the amendments above and the arguments below.

A. The Ryu Reference

The Ryu reference teaches a distributed data base system that is formed by terminal units connected in a public network or a private network. Each terminal unit stores the real data and a temporary center stores control information, such as contents corresponding to the real data, keywords, or commands assigned to the data.

B. The Oracle Reference

The Oracle reference teaches a database administration system for a relational database management system wherein a database administrator may perform database server operations either locally from the server or remotely from a client.

C. The Terry Reference

The Terry reference describes continuous queries to append-only databases. Where data is continuously added to a database, users can issue permanent queries and be notified whenever data matches the query.

D. The Dworkin Reference

The Dworkin reference describes an automated system that assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services sold by a plurality of vendors. The system includes a programmed computer which is linked to a database. The database contains information about a large number of different products and/or services, arranged in various categories. For each product or service, the database contains information on price, vendor, specifications, and/or availability.

E. Claims 1-14 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 are generally directed to an invention that provides a resource management system. The system comprises a plurality of servers, grouped into local servers and regional servers. The local servers comprise means for storing resources, and the regional servers comprise means for storing profiles of resources. The local and regional servers are linked together for electronically transferring profiles and resources therebetween. A PC, distinct from the local servers, is coupled to one or more of the servers, where the PC stores profiles of resources into one or more of the regional servers, searches all of the profiles in all of the regional servers, and accesses a resource from any of the local servers based on the searched profiles.

The cited references do not teach or suggest the elements of Applicant's independent claims directed to the PC, distinct from the local servers, storing profiles of resources into one or more of the regional servers, while storing the resources into the local servers. In addition, the cited references do not teach or suggest the elements of Applicant's independent claims directed to linking the local and regional servers together so that profiles and resources can be transferred therebetween. Moreover, the cited references do not teach or suggest the elements of Applicant's independent claims directed to the PC searching all of the profiles in all of the regional servers, and then accessing a resource from any of the local servers based on the searched profiles.

The user terminals of Ryu do not store profiles of resources into one or more of the regional servers; instead, user terminals merely access contents stored in the contents control center, while only the data terminals store contents into the control center. Moreover, there is no teaching in Ryu of linking the local and regional servers together so that both profiles and resources can be transferred therebetween; instead, only profiles are transferred from data terminals to the control center in Ryu. Finally, there is no teaching in Ryu of the PC searching all of the profiles in all of the

regional servers, and then accessing a resource from any of the local servers based on the searched profiles; instead, only a single control center is searched in Ryu.

The Oracle reference does not solve the deficiencies of the Ryu reference. Indeed, Oracle is cited only for teaching that a user may perform database server operations either locally from the server or remotely from a client. However, such operations cannot be said to comprise storing profiles of resources into one or more of the regional servers, or transferring both profiles and resources between linked local and regional servers, or searching all of the profiles in all of the regional servers, and then accessing a resource from any of the local servers based on the searched profiles.

Similarly, the Terry reference does not solve the combined deficiencies of the Ryu or Oracle references. Terry merely deals with continuous queries of a database, and thus is only cited against dependent claim 8.

Finally, the Dworkin reference does not solve the combined deficiencies of the Ryu, Oracle, or Terry references. Dworkin merely teaches a way to price shop via database query, and thus is only cited against dependent claim 11.

The novel limitations of the present invention allow for a client-server system that is more interchangeable and useful than those described in the prior art. Moreover, the various elements of the Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in the prior art. In addition, the Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by the prior art.

Thus, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 are allowable over Ryu, Oracle, Terry, and Dworkin. Further, dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-14 are submitted to be allowable over Ryu, Oracle, Terry, and Dworkin in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 6, and 9, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-14 recite additional novel elements not shown by Ryu, Oracle, Terry, and Dworkin.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain

that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


David M. Siefert

By his attorneys,

GATES & COOPER

6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: 11/20, 2000

By: 
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/io